THEME: Sins o Ho te for Missing on a Tumbled Would
II. The sing g the New Patrons

To summarize what I sad yestucteag on the fir t hor sammie lease:
(1) The first sign is The Sign $q$ the Trearme in the Pot". "We have the heamare in earthen vessels", said Paul. Client in his church, "the hope 7 glom." And the lesson was "Doit give up the Church". Am, thutations were fun m More.
(2) The second sign was "The Sign a the Geeing Dons". "Beheld I have net beper you an ger don", unite form in the Posse q Rureletion. My Mentation was Coxumunint Chine. And the lesson, "Don't give up the Ausisin".

This nom, the thin sign I wat to ret leper yon is"
"The Sign the Now Pastures." My illentations are the churches 7 the thin uned. My text could be Paul's places in his letter Fo the Plimippoint, cleptes1, verve 5,"I thant my god... In your pantreeship in the gunsel fum the fist day until now: And the lesson In ${ }_{1}{ }^{2}$ II cantor uned mission is this: Doit tm to do it alone.

All mp life the Chuntion church has been vulnerable to the chape that fist Islam (the Mohannudam), and then the communists levelled apanit it sit t deadly effectiveness: chantionity is the withe man's religion! It doen't belme in Apse; it doesn't belmp in Asia.

Inly yeas yo Islam was tetlmp Annie: Islam is black; Africa is black; Apsis and Islam belly teethes. And fo awhile back then, even the most optimistic expats were pedictriy that in on generation unless go Mohammedan. Intr yeas yo the communists were tettmy As ic, "Chuntianty is the relipins arm $f$ white colmulesmi. Dent let it into Aside". And
we watched helplessly as Asia's layest Ratio - the lagers in the ned. - Chine thew int the Chistcais and timed communist. While at the same time the second laxest nation in the uni, Indie - also an Asian notion - thew ont Buthite cromalrom, timed mdependent, and Hide and moressugly hostile to Chisitain misinis.

Gust hum pupificant a defeat this was In Chistion wield minion in these last forty yens can be measured by a remarkable statistical fact that is inst well kun. The population q the secund layest conch in Asia - not even the laxest, only the seand lowest Asian country - the prpuletion of India alme is alnint as great as the prometetion o two whole contents, Alice and latin America combed. When India ad China tuned apaint the expanding url minim 7 the Chintan church - the prophets of dorm grits correct ip and pesimisticilly posited ont that Chistain were losing ane than $\frac{1}{3}$ al closer to half 7 . all the purple in the limed.

That was ${ }^{\text {sine }} 40$ years ago. Churitianity was the "White man's religion" - and the propapande value of that p phase, used peinetwely seemed to be a deethblen to Chistian museum.

Put stramely unnoticed by the uned, in the unstery y God's prinidence, a starthing change was takmy place. A histom-bendinp chanpe. Smetimi in 1982, in the fint time in mue than 1200 years, the dommant enn of the global Chintian chuch changed from white to simetting darker.

There is a chant in the now Wrel Chintion Incgclofedia that lists the percentapes of Chnitians in the uned by thein colos, furm 30 AD, to 2000 , extrapilating totajis percentaes lito the next furteen years.

In Zo AD 95\% q the muld's xus were tan, only 5\% white.
In 1900 AD, the percentapes were comint ampletely reversed: $81 \%$ white, $5 \%$ tan, with new chors added-bleck, hmond yellm.
In 1982 - for the fint timi wite kno were len than 50\%, of the
 white $49 \%$; blech $18.5 \%$; monm $11 \%$, tan $11 \%$, yellow $7 \%$. (1982).
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CHURCHES OF THE THIRD WORLD
Mr. Moffett

## INTRODUCTION

The title of this course is CHURCHES OF THE THIRD WORLD. I am not entirely happy with the term "third world", but it is the most common designation now for that part of the world, east and south, which is to be distinguished from "the west" and largely the north, that is, the industrialized nations of the "first world" (Europe and North America), and the "second world" (the communist bloc). You will easily think of exceptions and objections to such a categorization, but it is roughly what we think of when the newspapers and the United Nations talk of the "third world": Asia, Africa and Latin America.

But the course is about the Churches of the third world. It is about what Archbishop Temple some years ago, in a famous speech given at his enthronement as the Archbishop of Canterbury, called "the great new fact of our" age. I quote it regularly in the introductory course on mission and ecumenics, but it belongs also inseparably in any introduction to a course on the churches of the third world. I make no apology for repeating it for it highlights the global importance as well as the significance in Christian mission of the rise of what he called the "younger churchers" and what we now more often call the "churches of the third world".

This is what William Temple said at Canterbury. The year was 1942, and the clouds of war were rolling over Europe:
"The world," he said, "is learning its helplessness apart from God though not yet is it on any great scale turning to Him for direction or for strength... rather is it towards more intense and fiercer competition, conflict and war between larger and ever larger concentrations of power...
"But there is another side to the picture. As though in preparation for such a time as this, God has been building up a Christian fellowship which now extends into almost every nation, and binds citizens of them all together in true unity and mutual love. No human agency has planned this. It is the result of the great missionary enterprise of the last hundred and fifty years. Neither the missionaries nor those who sent them out were aiming at the creation of a world-wide fellowship, interpenetrating the nations, bridging the gulfs between them, and supplying the promise of a check to their rivalries. The aim for nearly the whole period was to preach the gospel to as many individuals as could be reached so that those who were won to discipleship should be put in the way of eternal salvation. Almost incidentally the great world fellowship has arisen; it is the great new fact of our era.."
(The Church Looks Forward, p. 1-3)

What makes it a new fact is that the spreading growth and vitality of the churches of the third world have in the 20 th century for the first time in 2,000 years made Christianity a truly universal faith. For the first time in history there is now no single nation in the world without at least a handful of Christians in it. There are still a few small countries which have never had an organized church. And there are some larger ones like North Korea which once had a church in every city but where now not one single organized church remains, so far as we know. But only two countries in the world, according to the World Christian Encyclopedia (pp. 800f.) have no organized church, and in both countries there are isolated, perhaps hidden Christians. Those two are North Korea (pop. 18 million) and Mongolia (pop. 1 million). Some would now add Albania (pop. almost 3 million).

At the end of World War II, in 1945, two-thirds of all Korea's Christians were in the north. Today there is no record of an organized, recognized church there, though one may soon be allowed to $n$ ancrongol ia was entered by Roman Catholic missionaries in the 13th century, 600 years ago, and by Nestorian missionaries even before that, but when the Protestant missionary James Gilmour entered Mongolia in 1871 he could find no believers there, and when he left 21 years later after incredible hardships and heroic labors there were still no Mongolian Christians. He had worked for 21 years without a single baptism. (p. 495). As for Albania, the Eastern Orthodox Church seems to have survived the oppressions of the world's cruelest communist regime, but is under harsh and rigid control. There are no Protestants to report, though for a short while a Baptist pastor managed to gather a group of about 20 converts together. The last three Roman Catholic bishops disappeared without a trace in 1977. (p. 135).

All the other countries of the world, however, have an organized church. The church at last has circled the globe and however inadequately has "proclaimed the gospel to every nation". We shall later have to take another look at that. The Bible doesn't quite say "every nation". What Jesus commanded it to do in, the Great Commission
 more accurately translated "make disciples of every ethnic group" which is quite different and should rid us of the comfortable notion that the church's global task of evangelism, to say nothing of its broader responsibilities, is still unfinished. India, for example, is one nation, but it has 3000 ethnic groups. (McGavran, Ethnic Realities, p. 18)

What Is the Third World? Before we look more closely at the churches, $1 \frac{1}{\text { et }}$ me return for a moment to the question with which we started. What is the "third world"? I said I wasn't too happy with the term. Why? Primarily because it doesn't quite fit. I am going to use it because the alternatives are even more awkward. "Two-thirds world"? That's what some people call it, and if you think only in numbers it's reasonably accurate. But it's clumsy, and the world is made up of more than numbers. "Lafricasia"? That's even clumsier, although a great missiologist, Donald McGavran likes to use it, and it does at least describe what we usually mean: Latin America, Africa and Asia, as the "third world". So for want of a better term, I will use "third world",
remembering that "third" in the dictionary doesn't necessary mean less than first or second, or not as important as first and second. One of the dictionary meanings of "third" is simply "one of three", and that is how I will use it.

So what is this "third world"? Ten years ago or more when the term "third world" was fairly new and becoming increasingly popular, the news magazine U.S. News and World Report (March 31, 1975) tried to explain to its readers what "third world" really means. It listed seven characteristics which make the "third world" what it is, and those seven are worth repeating. The article said that 1) the "third world" is not an organization; 2) in numbers of people it is a majority of the world's population; 3) it is economically poor; 4) it is emotionally convinced that it has been cheated by the rich; 5) geographically, in general it is the southern half of the earth; 6) racially, it is the darker-skinned peoples of the world; and 7) politically, it tries hard and rather unsuccessfully to be neutral in the worldwide power struggle that divides the first world from the second world, the democracies from the communists. Let me elaborate a little on these seven points, which are more true than false but never altogether true nor altogether false.

1. Is the third world unorganized? Yes. There is no overall alliance of third world nations. Their only global forum of intenational communication is the United Naions, which is why the UN is very precious to them, and why so many are desperately dismayed by its decline. Did you see in this week's papers that the Gen. Secretary of the UN, Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar of Peru, was so pessimistic about the UN's future that like Winston Churchill who declared he was not about to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire, he (Perez de Cuellar) said "I don't see any reason why I should preside over the collaps of [the United Nations]. I don't have to..die with my ship". To the big nations the UN seems unrealistically in the control of little nations without power; and to the little nations, the UN doesn't seem to be able to help them when they most need help, as Mrs. Aquino quite rightly and pointedly noted yesterday. But where would the third world have a world forum for its views without the UN? It's their only structure with a global voice.
2. Is the third world the world of the majority? Yes. It really is the "two-thirds world" in numbers of people. If you doubt that, look at the population of the continents. The third world's Asia has $60 \%$ of all the people in the world; the first world's North America has only $6 \%$. It is the population factor that is the third world's only realistic claim to global power. It is what enables it to dominate discussion in the UN, much to the annoyance of the first and second worlds. But population has only a fragile hold on power. Population is as much a minus as a plus in today's tragically overpopulated world.

But that is to dexanbe the "thad unwed" purely in economic and georepphic terms, which wit gite eungh. Ten year apo an no re, when the term "thin unold" was moieasingly being used, the U.S. News and Wild Repeat (Mach 31, 1975) tried $F$ explain F insuring it reader what "Hud unld" really means. After pointup int int that "it's not an ramizatorn in any formal sense",." It dent even have a membership sol", the magazine listed seven charectaritios o what was being called the "thad wold" which are unit repeating.

1. Numbers. It is not a minority. It cane to the ul's whici when the United Naturs anddenly found that the so-called "third unold", is numihes 7 people, at least, and numbers of nations, was tend ster the frit and second unoldr but "first". And Cluritain have just discoed that then is the not only of peale of natives, bet $y$ Chusition and cliches, the "Hand" coned is fist.
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The title of this course is CHURCHES OF THE THIRD WORLD.. I am not entirely happy with the term "third world", but it is the most common designation now for that part of the world, east and south, which is to be distinguished from "the west", or the industrialized nations of the "first world" (Europe and North America), and the "second world" (the communist bloc). The third world, then, is roughly Asia, Africa and Latin America.

But the course is about the churches of the third world. It is about what Archbishop Temple some years ago, in a famous speech given at his enthronement as Archbishop of Canterbury, called "the great new fact of our" age. I quote it regularly in the introductory course on mission and ecumenics, but it belongs inseparably in any introduction to a course on third world churches, and I make not apology for repeating it, for it highlights the global importance as well as the significance in Christian mission of the rise of what he called "the younger churches", and what we now more often call "the churches of the third world."

This is what Archbishop William Temple said at Canterbury. The year was 1942, and the clouds of war were rolling over Europe.
"The world", he said," is learning its helplessness apart from God though not yet is it on any great scale turning to Him for direction or for strength... rather is it towards more intense and fiercer competition, conflict and war between larger and ever larger cocentrations of power...
"But there is another side to the picture. As though in preparation for such a time as this, God has been building up a Christian fellowship which now extends into almost every nation, and binds citizens of them all together in true unity and mutual love. No human agency has planned this. It is the result of the great missionary enterprise of the last hundred and fifty years. Neither the missionaries nor those who sent them out were aiming at the creation of a world-wide fellowship interpenetrating the nations, bridging the gulfs between them, and supplying the promise of a check to their rivalries. The aim for ~ nearly the whole period was to preach the gospel to as many individuals as could be reached so that those who were won to discipleship should be put in the way of eternal salvation. Almost incidentally the great world-fellowship has arisen; it is the great new fact of our era..."
(The Church Looks Forward, pp. 1-3)
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Pat on the the beng, $d$ at least in the firt sepment of the conve. I want to thinis of the uneld, and uned the thind uneld reqment $g$ it, in tems $q$ thee cotyones: (1) Colm , (2) Nation and (3) Denelopmat.

The UN (d Wuld Chisition Encuclipuedie) analyzes the
nations in tro duffeinent wap -

(a) in printical alpnment in three gimps:

1. Western uned - the co-called "fist unld". 35 cuntros.
2. Communit unid - the po-called "second unied" 30 cominses
3. The thad uned - "the so celled "un-aly red netomis: 158 cmatisis
(3) Ind
by development.
4. Mre develofed ryion .-5, conntres
5. les develofed reyins 172 comitus.
connivation, oos ine western wo bo
I. Whe at it fint by chmo - Whichn haw mot y the uneld still pites fenge

Who said Chistonity was. a white manis relpion? They say,
that ine 1981/82 in the fint the meas the majinty
 yon want to call the colos) - and white chisitain are now, and probably
alwans will be in the mininty - until the Millennium.

two-Aturds if the 7 uned's 223 cominef. Chuitains the majoits (gher 5010 ); in, one-Hand then ale stilla] poinuinty. This spreed ip very finmen, Hinpt (see glopal May 1) Chisitains number may $90 \% \mathrm{~m} 100$ countries; less 10\% in 51 coputries, lon than 170 in 24 cedintines, and les than $0.1 \%$ in 6 comitras: Atghamptan." Bejatan, Mepal, Smatio, Norty Yemen, afd Sintt Yemom.

The chart, (anp. 3 q othe Wuld kn Enc.) is smatting lify thes:
Churituris Amms Praletain 7 the Wuld.


Stylized shim conno.
tts Black- African, hegroid
\#2 Burm. Rranchan, N.Inchan, Oceanic (uned pup. $1,004,921,000$ )


\#1. Yellow = Asion $\times$ Pacatio
Red. Ames Ind. (midepy. 918, 190,700)
grean = $a_{n-1}$. s. on . bushmen.

The chent shows that the fentest declining cinm in uneld Chustanity is White (hrm $81 \%$ in 1900 t $50 \%$ in 1950 to an estruited $40 \%$ in 2000 AD); The fartest nisiny chom is black (ham $4 \frac{1}{2} \%$ in 1900, \% $18 \%$, $\hbar 23 \%$ in 2000); the in sate sumbt.
 -1980 d $8 \frac{1}{2} \%$ in 2.000): While aclre futh in bumin (pum 5\%. 1900, \& $11 \% 1980 . d$ $13 \%$ in 2,000).

Remenber that in phaple (not $x_{n s}$ )
 $\cdots$ tom (Inatlle Sant) each Love abut $\frac{1}{2}$ a billim fergle.

Thine in a moment abont what the means of the unld Chinstion unsion in on time. Here are sme brij tumptts.
(yinituluty, matenally)

1. The old pormer base n 4 'Cuntion minsins is evodup. Chustianty
 What the thind-uned smetmies shell calb it - "a "sinte man's selyion".
$a$ white retipion
2. But it in't a an lompes. As of the yeer it's corm is danker than white.
3. This probably means a slift in the base q. minsin form the mest is the thand-aned if Chuitais are gong क carry ant the Bibicial mandate of reacinif the whore uneld with a clas, effectrie presentation $q$ the live and clarms $f$ gems Chint.
4. The purmer base 7 misimin inll probably. shif t the pentes who are turmip faster is fuid geens - Chuit as ind ol Savim than others - thalades yellwa and tmm m races of thes uneld.
5. Therefre, in any planning of the finture 7 the Clunstan chich, it its unold mosin, it is aboolutely inferative

EC 43. Totholutum
that the thind-uned chuncts becone an $\qquad$ nidopenseble part $\rightarrow$ the plansing and operatori. Western planning if uned misim, $y$. it is dine in solation $\qquad$ from the chunces of the thind unld, is obsolete. Nothing int corperative uned planning is uneld Chintain missin $\qquad$ inll do in totayis uned. We live in a new pituation.
II. Bat Cuhm, as we knw, is a very infaffect, hophey stylized criterin In daiduy the umold's proulation nito catepmes - thy it is still one $q$ the mot prevalent. Auster but undelywsed cateron is political. Whe dinde up the uned's prpmetain by countries. Here to we find a statitioy chanes: - In Comens day

If we measure the speed $q$. Chisitanity politically by blocs 7 countries, as y 1980,

The Wertem uneld's 35 conntues had $38 \%$ of the unlds $x$ wn. ( 547 m.$)$
The commuint unids 30 comotries has $18 \% \ldots \ldots(254 \mathrm{~m})$
The thand unlds 158 countris hes $44 \% \ldots(63 / \mathrm{m}$.

- Whel mamme. - p.y. Teth
 the unild by conntues, foes on to say that,
"In $2 / 37$ the inill's 223 constures, Chuitains und form the majirity (mee sor); in ore -thad [of the uned's comentues they me stull a ] minaity. This spued is very uneven thangh (see gosbel rep 11. Chistain number tery oner $90 \%$ in 100 countries; less than $10 \%$ in 51 countrios; les than 190 in 24 conutries, and less then $\frac{1}{10} 71 \%$ in 6 contries: Apghanstan, Bhutar, Nopal, Somalia, Nuth Yemen and Suth Yemen.. ( $p, 3$ ).
I note thet Nepal is clasified as $\frac{1}{10}$, $1 \%$ Chinitan, int thise hymis are as 7 a fow year so. Today thaus of the low-key but amezuidy effectwe wituen of the United Mmin $\frac{\square}{}$ Nepal. in gist the last thrue a frm years, I thunh that Nepral, sull in the clas $q$ repuins where pubbe evorugehoin is absutulety prividien, has become at leat mne than 1\% (not 10 q $1 \%_{0}$ ) Chustan.

EC 43. 3nd Wred Chunches

Tht
B. Tutroduction to the Third Wred Clunches.

Pont it is the 3nd uned chunches which is the promain sukject $q$ this couse. So bepre we tunn to continental sunvers $q$ Aruican, Latin Amesican and Asian Chiritconity, let me make some pelimmany obsenvations abut the situation of the clunches in the thind uned.

Trit, does the chund the Chintion clunch is extremely unevenly dustributed in the und uned. Its (comling tolal $x$ on odherats percentape of the prpulation, in the three thind-unld contmints ranpes hom
 is practically murin-revesed: Latin Americe abut 95\% nominal Clustom'; Asia abut $95 \%$ numinal um-Chustionwith Aprice Laff-way between.

By way $q$ compansi, Jeshap I shull add $1^{5 t}+2^{\text {ned }}$ unded Fiums: -

| (2) $85,3 \%$ | in Nutt Anerice | $(219,833,000$ | of $245,837,000)$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (3) $85.4 \%$ | in Cunfe | $(415,601,000$ | q | $486,436,000)$ |
| (3) $36,1 \%$ | in USSR | $(96,727,000$ | of $268,115,000)$ |  |

If we exclude laypely Chisitian (techavicallely Chuntemi) laton America, and examine Asia and Afices a little nore clsely as to the relpions situation on thre two contmenits, I is better fersopes to dinde them into three secturn: Alvice, Sunth Asie and East Asia.

Africa is almest evenly divided between Chustions and Mushims, with Chintians recantty having a slejit edpe. Bepe 1970 Mushim had been in the majouty. Ant in 1980 the statatics were

Chintions $203 \mathrm{millim}(203,490,000)-44.2 \%, 7$ Apricis prpputition.
Mushin 190 millim $(189,728,00), 41.2 \%_{0} \quad 11$
Tribal celyiun by milhin $(63,872,00)-13.9 \%$
(Would min kuc,, 1.782 )
Moving eart it accos the Red See I Indion ocean nite Asie, bequming with South Asie (which moludes the Asion Mudlle Enot), the lampest



Eest Asia, apain, is very diffeint. In 1950. by for the layent smping called itall "no-relpumi"".


New Relyinits
Mudins
Shamonots
Chistain
Shomants

34 mullimi $(34,29,000) 3.2 \pi$
22 mullum $(21,491,000) 2.0 \%$
19 milhm $(19.026,000) 1.8 \%$
$13 \quad 13,058,000) 1.2 \%$
0.5
0.3

Pupulation 19so. Afnce 461 millino


